REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 16-28 remain elected for examination in the present application. Claims 10-15 have been withdrawn. Claim 30 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. By this response, claims 1, 16 and 20 have been amended and claims 29-31 have been canceled without prejudice. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections

Claims 1-9, 16-29 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants traverse this rejection and assert that the rejected claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the claimed invention.

In particular, the Office Action states that in claims 1 and 20, "it is not clear what is the context and meaning of the resume condition and how the detected condition is used." At the outset, Applicants point out that it is clear from dependent claims 2 and 21, respectively, that one use for the claimed resume condition is to switch an allocation module from a decoder reading state to a trace cache reading state. Notwithstanding, claims 1 and 20 have been amended to clarify that the claimed resume condition is a trace cache reading resume condition. For at least the above reasons, claims 1-9, 16-29 and 31 are not indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the instant rejection.

Claims 1-9 and 16-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,055,630 to D'Sa. Applicants traverse this rejection and assert that D'Sa fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations.

With specific regard to claims 1 and 16, D'Sa does not provide for determining whether a resume condition is present based on a second instruction, where the determining is conducted *before the second instruction leaves the decoder* as claimed. Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that in D'Sa "the determination is performed at the trace cache stage" (Final Office Action, pg. 3), which is located after the decoder stage in D'Sa (see D'Sa FIG. 1b). For at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 16 are patentable over D'Sa.

With specific regard to claim 20, D'Sa does not describe control logic to determine whether a trace cache reading resume condition is present based on a second instruction *before the second instruction leaves a decoder* as claimed. In particular, the instruction decoder 120 of D'Sa has no functionality for identifying resume conditions. For at least the above reasons, claim 20 is patentable over D'Sa. Claims 2-9, 17-19 and 21-28 depend from claims 1, 16 and 20, and therefore also recite patentable subject matter.

Response Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Expedited Procedure - Art Unit 2111
Docket No.: P12006

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass this case to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 703.633.0962.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/21/05

B. Delano Jordan
Registration No. 43,698

Intel Americas, Inc.
4030 Lafayette Center Drive
Building LF3
Chantilly, VA 20151

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on the date shown below.

By: _____
Rachael Brown

Date: 3/21/05